



## Minnesota Board of Marriage and Family Therapy



### Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting March 18, 2011

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Herb Grant, Chair  
Mark Flaten, Vice-Chair  
Sara Wright, Secretary  
Kay Ek  
Denny Morrow  
John Seymour

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Manijeh Daneshpour

#### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Jennifer Mohlenhoff, Executive Director

#### **GUESTS:**

Nathan Hart, Attorney General's Office  
Mary Hayes, Ph.D.  
Bruce Minor, Argosy University  
Steve Peltier, St. Mary's University  
Students

### **I. ORAL EXAMINATION**

Eight (8) oral examinations were administered. Upon successful completion, licenses were issued to: Leslie Kreofsky, Linda Kordosky, Lisa Dee, Nancy Achterhoff, Monica Smith, Mary Drouillard, Anna Sterk, and Debra Schmidt.

### **II. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Herb Grant called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. in the University Room of the University Park Plaza Building.

### **III. CONSIDER AGENDA**

Mark Flaten requested that an issue regarding post-graduate supervised experience candidates be added to the agenda. John Seymour requested that a discussion regarding corrections of grammatical errors in the oral examination test be discussed. Both items were added to the agenda.

### **IV. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2011, BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes of the February 18, 2011, Board meeting were approved as written and passed on a motion by Sara Wright, seconded by Mark Flaten.

## **V. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

Jennifer Mohlenhoff gave the Administrative Report as follows.

### Budget Report:

The current monthly budget report and vendor payment report was presented to members.

### Legislative Update:

Funding and MFT legislative change item to codify fees in statute are continuing through the legislative process. The House's appropriations bill addressing all HLBs does not include the Governor's proposal to move all HLBs to a special, dedicated revenue fund. The House instead proposes funding the MFT Board (and other HLBs) as it has in the past, through a direct appropriation.

### National Exam Test Scores:

Members reviewed a score report from the winter administration of the national examination. Minnesota candidates scored above the national average. Jennifer stated that another exam window has been added, and candidates will soon be able to submit applications online to PES rather than completing a paper application. A web seminar will be held for Boards to learn how this process will be done.

### Rule Revision:

Jennifer stated the Board of Psychology is in a similar process of rule revision and that she has received a copy of a "Formal Request for Comment of Proposed Permanent Rules Relating to the Practice of Psychology (RD4001.)" Jennifer stated that she will review the report to determine if it contains useful information that could be applied toward the MFT rule revision process. She will also provide the Board with the electronic link to the Board of Psychology's proposed rules.

### April Board Meeting:

Jennifer stated that the next Board meeting will be held on April 8, 2011, with rule revision being the sole agenda item. Members agreed to set additional dates in April for oral exams. Jennifer stated that she will email members with a list of possible dates.

### Survey:

Jennifer and members reviewed and held discussion regarding a draft of a statistical survey from the Minnesota Department of Rural Health and Primary Care, which will be disseminated to LMFTs. John Seymour suggested that the categories addressing populations served by LMFTs be further broken down, particularly the youth category, to better learn what age groups are being served and, possibly, under served. Suggestions regarding a possibly revision as to work sites has also been received from Mark Flaten. Jennifer stated that she plans to meet with representatives from the department and will notify members if there are questions or requests for additional information.

## **VI. VARIANCE REVIEW**

In regard to a variance which was previously approved with conditions, members reviewed an outline of an individual's specific strategies for taking the national examination an 8<sup>th</sup> time. Mark Flaten made a motion to accept the plan which meets the Board's conditions and to allow the individual to sit for the exam. John Seymour seconded the motion. The motion passed.

## **VII. DOCUMENTATION OF SUPERVISOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mark Flaten discussed an issue that had been brought to his attention by a post-graduate supervised experience licensee candidate. The candidate is supervised by an individual who does not work at her place of employment. The candidate's employer does not allow the candidate to document in therapy notes any recommendations re: client treatment made by the supervisor, since the

supervisor is not employed by the agency/clinic. The candidate expressed concern to Mark Flaten about not being able to include this information in therapy notes. Following discussion regarding the ethical and legal responsibilities of those supervising license candidates, it was agreed that the rule revision currently under discussion should better clarify the supervisor's role. In discussion, Board members acknowledged that employers are free to limit records to those employed by the agency/clinic. Discussion regarding contractual agreements between supervisors, supervisees and employers were discussed, as well as the possibility of requiring supervisor/supervisee consultation to be documented independently by the supervisee, when documentation in client notes was not an option. It was agreed that supervisees could be advised to keep separate clinical notes, when documentation of supervisor recommendations in the employer's file is not possible. The supervisor/supervisee role will be further discussed as part of the rule revision.

## **VIII. ORAL EXAM**

John Seymour raised the issue that certain small, grammatical errors, or errors in language choice, exist in the oral examination used today. Since the proposed corrections do not address the substance of the exam questions, John Seymour proposed making these corrections and having Board members review the proposed revisions to ensure there are no questions or concerns. Following discussion, Board members agreed to review the oral exam questions, sign-off on proposed corrections, and direct Board staff to make the revisions prior to the next time this oral examination would be administered.

## **IX. RULE REVISION**

Members discussed and made revisions to the rules.

## **X. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### Application Committee:

Nine (9) applicants were approved to sit for the state examination.

44 applicants were approved to sit for the national examination.

### Personnel Committee:

Herb Grant stated that he will email members an evaluation form to complete for evaluation of Jennifer Mohlenhoff's job performance.

### Complaint Committee:

The Complaint Committee met on March 2, 2011. The next scheduled meeting is April 5, 2011.

### Continuing Education Committee:

The Continuing Education Committee continues to handle review of CE applications electronically.

## **XI. PUBLIC INPUT**

There was no public input.

## **XII. OTHER ITEMS**

There were no other items.

## **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Herb Grant adjourned the meeting at 12:30 p.m. on a motion by John Seymour and seconded by Sara Wright.

I hereby attest that these minutes were read and approved by the Board of Marriage and Family Therapy on April 8, 2011.

---

Sara Wright, Secretary